

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/735,613	FUKUDA, SHIGEO	
	<b>Examiner</b> Kevin M. Bernatz	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** allowed

(1) Kevin M. Bernatz. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Scott Brairton. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 11 January 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

14,15

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that the prior art of record appeared to lack sufficient specificity to teach or render obvious the claimed invention, wherein the magnitude of the "weak" leakage magnetic flux density was explicitly claimed to be 35 mT to 200 mT, per Applicants' specification (page 36). Applicants agreed to the proposed changes..